United Nations A/64/220

General Assembly

Distr.: General
11 August 2009

Original: English

Sixty-fourth session
Item 141 of the provisional agenda*
Scale of assessments for the apportionment of the expenses of United Nations peacekeeping operations

Implementation of General Assembly resolutions 55/235 and 55/236

Report of the Secretary-General

Summary

In its resolution 55/235, the General Assembly reaffirmed the principles underlying the financing of United Nations peacekeeping operations and adopted a new system of adjustments of the scale of assessments for the regular budget to be used in fixing rates of assessment applicable to peacekeeping operations. This system was based on assigning each Member State to one of 10 levels, using its average per capita gross national product during the period 1993-1998 and other criteria. In its resolution 55/236, the Assembly welcomed voluntary movements by a number of Member States to levels higher than would result from the application of the new system.

Also in resolution 55/235, the General Assembly requested the Secretary-General to update the composition of the levels on a triennial basis, in conjunction with the reviews of the scale of assessments for the regular budget, in accordance with the criteria established in the resolution, and to report thereon to the Assembly. The first such report was submitted in 2003, and the second in 2006. By the same resolution, the Assembly decided that the structure of contribution levels to be implemented from 1 July 2001 would be reviewed after nine years.

By its resolution 61/243, the General Assembly recalled its decision to review the structure of levels of contribution for peacekeeping operations after nine years and decided to carry out the review at its sixty-fourth session. In light of its decision, the Assembly requested the Secretary-General to report to it at its sixty-fourth session on the updating of the composition of levels of contribution for peacekeeping operations for the period from 2010 to 2012.

* A/64/150.

09-43874 (E) 260809

Please recycle

The present report responds to the Assembly's request and provides information on updating the composition of levels of contribution for peacekeeping operations for the period from 2010 to 2012. Information is provided on changes in the peacekeeping levels of Member States based on average per capita gross national income during the period from 2002 to 2007. These are based on the data used by the Committee on Contributions in reviewing the scale of assessments for the period from 2010 to 2012, which will be considered by the General Assembly during its sixty-fourth session.

Until the General Assembly has adopted a new scale, it will not be possible to determine the corresponding rates of assessment for peacekeeping for the period from 2010 to 2012. Further, any adjustments to the structure of contribution levels for peacekeeping operations, as may be decided by the Assembly at its sixty-fourth session, would also need to be taken into account in determining the rates of assessment for peacekeeping. For illustrative purposes, however, on the basis of the existing structure of contributions levels, annex IV shows the peacekeeping rates of assessment corresponding to the scale of assessments for the period from 2010 to 2012 included for information in the report of the Committee on Contributions.

Contents

		Page
I.	Introduction	3
II.	Composition of levels for the financing of peacekeeping operations	5
III.	Rates of assessment for the financing of peacekeeping operations	7
IV.	Conclusions	7
Annexes		
I.	Letter dated 6 August 2009 from the Chargé d'affaires a.i. of the Permanent Mission of Hungary to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General	8
II.	Peacekeeping levels, based on average per capita gross national income of Member States and other factors	9
III.	Implementation of General Assembly resolutions 55/235 and 55/236, 2010-2012	10
IV.	Effective rates of assessment for peacekeeping operations, 1 January 2010 to 31 December 2012, based on the results of the application of the methodology used in preparing the scale of assessments for the period 2007-2009 to GNI data for the period 2002-2007	17

I. Introduction

1. In its resolution 1874 (S-IV) of 27 June 1963, the General Assembly established certain principles to be applied to the financing of peacekeeping operations. Subsequently, in its resolution 3101 (XXVIII) of 11 December 1973, the Assembly made ad hoc arrangements for the financing of the United Nations Emergency Force (UNEF) based on those principles. These ad hoc arrangements involved basing each Member State's rate of assessment for UNEF on its rate of assessment for the regular budget, as adjusted on the basis of its assignment to one of four groups. Member States in groups C and D had their regular budget rates reduced by 80 and 90 per cent respectively, those in group B paid at the same rate and the permanent members of the Security Council, assigned to group A, paid the difference pro rata to their rates of assessment for the regular budget. This ad hoc formula was applied subsequently, subject to a number of changes over the years to the membership of groups B, C and D.

2. In its resolution 55/235 of 23 December 2000, the General Assembly reaffirmed the principles set out in its resolutions 1874 (S-IV) of 27 June 1963 and 3101 (XXVIII) of 11 December 1973. The Assembly also reaffirmed the following general principles underlying the financing of United Nations peacekeeping operations:

(a) The financing of such operations is the collective responsibility of all States Members of the United Nations and, accordingly, the costs of peacekeeping operations are expenses of the Organization to be borne by Member States in accordance with Article 17, paragraph 2, of the Charter of the United Nations;

(b) In order to meet the expenditures caused by such operations, a different procedure is required from that applied to meet expenditures under the regular budget of the United Nations;

(c) Whereas the economically more developed countries are in a position to make relatively larger contributions to peacekeeping operations, the economically less developed countries have a relatively limited capacity to contribute towards peacekeeping operations involving heavy expenditures;

(d) The special responsibilities of the permanent members of the Security Council for the maintenance of peace and security should be borne in mind in connection with their contributions to the financing of peace and security operations;

(e) Where circumstances warrant, the General Assembly should give special consideration to the situation of any Member States which are victims of, and those which are otherwise involved in, the events or actions leading to a peacekeeping operation.

3. By resolution 55/235, the General Assembly established a new system of adjustments of regular budget scale rates in determining Member States' rates of assessment for peacekeeping operations. This system was based on a number of criteria, including a comparison of the average per capita gross national product (GNP) of each Member State during the six-year base period used for preparing the scale of assessments with the corresponding average for all Member States. These criteria, which were set out in paragraph 10 of resolution 55/235, were used to place

each Member State in one of 10 levels, from A to J. In that regard, the General Assembly decided the following:

(a) Assessment rates for the financing of peacekeeping operations should be based on the scale of assessments for the regular budget of the United Nations, with an appropriate and transparent system of adjustments based on levels of Member States, consistent with the principles outlined above;

(b) The permanent members of the Security Council should form a separate level and, consistent with their special responsibilities for the maintenance of peace and security, should be assessed at a higher rate than for the regular budget;

(c) All discounts resulting from adjustments to the regular budget assessment rates of Member States in levels C through J should be borne on a pro rata basis by the permanent members of the Security Council;

(d) The least developed countries should be placed in a separate level and receive the highest rate of discount available under the scale;

(e) The statistical data used for setting the rates of assessment for peacekeeping should be the same as the data used in preparing the regular budget scale of assessments, subject to the provisions of resolution 55/235;

(f) Levels of discount should be created to facilitate automatic, predictable movement between categories on the basis of the per capita gross national product of Member States.

4. In establishing the system, the General Assembly decided, also by resolution 55/235, that Member States would be assigned to the lowest level of contribution with the highest discount for which they are eligible, unless they indicated a decision to move to a higher level. Transitions specified for 2001-2003 in resolution 55/236 would occur in equal increments over the transition period and, after 2001-2003, transition periods of two years would apply to countries moving up by two levels and transition periods of three years would apply to countries moving up by three levels or more. The Assembly requested the Secretary-General to update the composition of the levels on a triennial basis, in conjunction with the regular budget scale of assessment reviews, in accordance with the criteria established above, and to report thereon to the Assembly. Finally, the Assembly decided that the structure of contribution levels to be implemented from 1 July 2001 would be reviewed after nine years.

5. In its resolution 55/236, also of 23 December 2000, the General Assembly welcomed decisions by a number of Member States to move voluntarily to higher levels than required under the criteria set out in paragraph 10 of resolution 55/235.

6. By its resolution 61/243 of 22 December 2006, the General Assembly recalled its decision in resolution 55/235 to review the structure of levels of contribution for peacekeeping operations after nine years, and decided to carry out the review at its sixty-fourth session. In light of its decision, the Assembly requested the Secretary-General to report to it at its sixty-fourth session on the updating of the composition of levels of contribution for peacekeeping operations for the period from 2010 to 2012.

7. In previous reports on the implementation of General Assembly resolutions 55/235 and 55/236,[1] the Secretary-General outlined his understanding of the provisions of the resolutions and how he intended to carry out his responsibilities under resolution 55/235. The present report reflects the understandings outlined in those earlier reports. It also reflects a request sent by Hungary on 6 August 2009 (see annex I).

II. Composition of levels for the financing of peacekeeping operations

8. The initial composition of levels used for establishing rates of assessment for peacekeeping operations for the period 1 July 2001 to 31 December 2003 was listed in the annex to General Assembly resolution 55/235. Permanent members of the Security Council were included in level A. Member States on the list of the least developed countries were included in level J. Specified Member States were included in level C. The placement of other Member States was based on their average per capita GNP during the six-year base period (data for 1993-1998) used for the scale of assessments for 2001-2003 in relation to the average for all Member States. The thresholds applied were set out in the table in paragraph 10 of resolution 55/235. The initial placement of Member States in levels B and D to I was based on their average per capita GNP for the six-year base period 1993-1998 and the average per capita GNP of all Member States for that period, which was $4,797.

9. Since 2001, the scale of assessments has been prepared using two base periods, of six and three years. On the basis of the provisions of resolution 55/235 and the practice adopted by the General Assembly for the composition of levels for the period 2001-2003, the Secretary-General has subsequently updated the composition of levels for the periods 2004-2006 and 2007-2009 using the average data on gross national income (GNI) for the six-year base period used by the Committee on Contributions in considering the scale of assessments for these periods. As outlined in the Committee's report on its sixty-second session,[2] the concept of GNP in the System of National Accounts, 1968 has been renamed GNI in the System of National Accounts, 1993, but this is just a refinement of product and income concepts and does not entail a change in the actual coverage of the concept.

10. In updating the composition of levels for the periods 2004-2006 and 2007-2009, the base periods 1996-2001 and 1999-2004 were used respectively. Average per capita GNI for all Member States of $5,094 and $5,517.84 were reported for the base periods 1996-2001 and 1999-2004 respectively.

11. The General Assembly has not so far decided on the elements of the methodology to be used in preparing the scale of assessments for the period 2010-2012. In the absence of any specific guidance from the Assembly with regard to the new scale, the Committee on Contributions at its sixty-ninth session in 2009 decided to review the scale of assessments for the period 2010-2012 on the basis of its general mandate under rule 160 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly and the provisions of resolution 58/1 B of 23 December 2003. In doing

[1] A/C.5/55/38 and Add.1, A/58/157 and Add.1, and A/61/139 and Corr.1 and Add.1.

[2] *Official Records of the General Assembly, Fifty-seventh Session, Supplement No. 11* (A/57/11), para. 8.

so, it agreed on certain conclusions and recommendations with regard to the methodology, reviewed the data provided by the United Nations Statistics Division for the period 2002-2007, decided that the market exchange rates of a number of Member States should be adjusted and provided, for information, machine scales showing the results of applying to the GNI data for 2002-2007 the methodology used in preparing the scale of assessments for the period 2007-2009.

12. In updating the composition of levels of contribution for peacekeeping operations for the period 2010-2012, the Secretary-General was guided by the provisions of General Assembly resolutions 55/235 and 55/236, his understanding of the mandates therein as outlined in his earlier reports and the practice adopted by the Assembly in fixing the composition of levels for earlier periods. Accordingly, data for the six-year period 2002-2007 was used in updating the composition of levels for the period 2010-2012 and the corresponding thresholds are shown in annex II to the present report. These are based on the provisions of resolution 55/235 and each Member State's average per capita GNI for 2002-2007 in relation to the membership average of $6,707.92. The illustrative information in the present document reflects level C on the basis of the composition specified in the annex to resolution 55/235. In setting out his understanding of the implementation of resolutions 55/235 and 55/236 (see A/C.5/55/38, paras. 13 and 16), the Secretary-General indicated that, since there were no criteria specified for inclusion in level C, the countries listed under level C in the annex to resolution 55/235 would remain in level C at least until the review of the structure of levels at the main part of the sixty-fourth session of the General Assembly. Further, it was the understanding of the Secretariat that, in updating the composition of the 10 levels, the Secretary-General should include those countries at their voluntarily established levels for 2001-2003 unless their revised levels would otherwise be higher or unless they indicated a decision to revert to a lower level for which they were eligible in the new scale period.

13. On that basis, and prior to the application of any phasing or voluntary movements, the Czech Republic would move up from level G to level E, Croatia would move up from level I to level H, Estonia would move up from level I to level F (but is assumed to remain voluntarily at level B), Hungary would move up from level H to level F (but is assumed to remain voluntarily at level B), Latvia would move up from level I to level H (but is assumed to remain voluntarily at level H*), the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya would move up from level I to level H, Lithuania would move up from level I to level H (but is assumed to remain voluntarily at level H*), Malta would move up from level D to level B (currently its voluntary level), Poland would move up from level I to level H (but is assumed to remain voluntarily at level H*), Saint Kitts and Nevis would move down from level G to level H, Saudi Arabia would move up from level F to level E, Slovakia would move up from level H to level G (equivalent to its current voluntary level of H*) and Trinidad and Tobago would move up from level G to level E.

14. Under the provisions of General Assembly resolution 55/235, the upward movements of the Czech Republic and Trinidad and Tobago are subject to the appropriate transitional periods. These have been applied in the manner outlined in the Secretary-General's earlier report (A/C.5/55/38) and are reflected in annex III to the present report. As Malta is currently at level B voluntarily, it is assumed that no phasing would be required during 2010-2012.

15. In its resolution 55/236, the General Assembly welcomed the voluntary commitment of a number of Member States to contribute to peacekeeping operations at a rate higher than required by their per capita income. In updating the composition of levels in previous years, it has been the Secretariat's understanding that the Member States concerned should be included at their voluntarily established levels unless their revised levels would be higher or unless they indicate a decision to revert to a lower level for which they are eligible in the new scale period. In this connection, the Secretary-General has received a letter dated 6 August 2009 from the Chargé d'affaires a.i. of the Permanent Mission of Hungary to the United Nations requesting that Hungary be allowed to move to level F, from its current level of B, in keeping with the fundamental principle of capacity to pay (see annex I to the present report). Hungary fell within level H in 2006-2009, but remained voluntarily at level B. On the basis of the peacekeeping levels and thresholds set out in annex II, Hungary would fall within level F in 2010-2012. The updated composition of levels in annex III reflects this request.

III. Rates of assessment for the financing of peacekeeping operations

16. As reflected in annex II to the present report, the composition of levels of contribution for peacekeeping operations for 2010-2012 has been updated in accordance with the provisions of General Assembly resolution 55/235. The updated composition of levels, subject to adjustments arising from the General Assembly's review of the structure of contribution levels, would be used together with the scale of assessments for 2010-2012 to establish each Member State's peacekeeping rate of assessment. The General Assembly will consider the scale of assessments for the period from 2010 to 2012 during its sixty-fourth session. Until it has adopted a new scale, it will not be possible to determine the corresponding rates of assessment for peacekeeping for the period from 2010 to 2012.

17. For illustrative purposes, however, annex III shows the peacekeeping rates of assessment (correct to four decimal places) corresponding to the scale of assessments for the period from 2010 to 2012 included for information in the report of the Committee on Contributions.[3]

IV. Conclusions

18. The General Assembly may wish to take note of this report and decide on the structure of levels of contribution for peacekeeping operations, and the composition for the period from 2010 to 2012.

[3] Ibid., *Sixty-fourth Session, Supplement No. 11* (A/64/11), para. 74.

Annex I

Letter dated 6 August 2009 from the Chargé d'affaires a.i. of the Permanent Mission of Hungary to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General

I have the honour to refer to the scale of assessments for the apportionment of the expenses of United Nations peacekeeping operations, where Hungary was listed under category B in General Assembly resolution 55/236. Hungary has made a voluntary movement and decided to move from level I to level B, with a transition time of five years, starting on 1 July 2001 and ending on 1 July 2005. It will be recalled that this movement to contribute to the peacekeeping operations was at a rate much higher than required for Hungary under the current arrangement of the apportionment of the expenses of the United Nations peacekeeping operations.

In view of the growing financial burden arising from the continuous and significant increase in the United Nations peacekeeping operations budget over the last years and the current economic situation which has made it difficult for Hungary to meet its financial obligations at a higher rate than required, my Government requests that Hungary be allowed to move to level F from level B of the peacekeeping scale of assessments in keeping with the fundamental principle of "capacity to pay".

I should be grateful if you could arrange to have my Government's request duly reflected in your report on updating the composition of the peacekeeping scale levels for 2010-2012, to be submitted to the General Assembly at its sixty-fourth session.

(*Signed*) Attila **Zimonyi**
Chargé d'affaires a.i.

Annex II

Peacekeeping levels, based on average per capita gross national income of Member States and other factors

Level	*Criteria*	*Threshold in United States dollars (2010-2012)*	*Discount (per cent)*
A	Permanent members of the Security Council	Not applicable	Premium
B	All Member States, except those covered below and level A	Not applicable	0
C	As listed in the annex to General Assembly resolution 55/235	Not applicable	7.5
D	Member States with per capita GNI less than 2 times the average for all Member States (except level A, C and J contributors)	Under 13,416	20
E	Member States with per capita GNI less than 1.8 times the average for all Member States (except level A, C and J contributors)	Under 12,074	40
F	Member States with per capita GNI less than 1.6 times the average for all Member States (except level A, C and J contributors)	Under 10,733	60
G	Member States with per capita GNI less than 1.4 times the average for all Member States (except level A, C and J contributors)	Under 9,391	70
H	Member States with per capita GNI less than 1.2 times the average for all Member States (except level A, C and J contributors)	Under 8,050	80 (or 70 on a voluntary basis)[a]
I	Member States with per capita GNI less than the average for all Member States (except level A, C and J contributors)	Under 6,708	80
J	Least developed countries (except level A and C contributors)	Not applicable	90

[a] Member States in level H* have a discount of 70 per cent.

Annex III

Implementation of General Assembly resolutions 55/235 and 55/236, 2010-2012

Member State	*Level in 2009*	*Voluntary level during 2009 if different*	*Level in 2010-2012 based on data for 2002-2007*	*Assumed voluntary level in 2010-2012 if different*	*Percentage of regular budget rates payable*	
					2010	*2011-2012*
Afghanistan	J		J		10	10
Albania	I		I		20	20
Algeria	I		I		20	20
Andorra	B		B		100	100
Angola	J		J		10	10
Antigua and Barbuda	F		F		40	40
Argentina	I		I		20	20
Armenia	I		I		20	20
Australia	B		B		100	100
Austria	B		B		100	100
Azerbaijan	I		I		20	20
Bahamas	B		B		100	100
Bahrain	B		B		100	100
Bangladesh	J		J		10	10
Barbados	E		E		60	60
Belarus	I		I		20	20
Belgium	B		B		100	100
Belize	I		I		20	20
Benin	J		J		10	10
Bhutan	J		J		10	10
Bolivia	I		I		20	20
Bosnia and Herzegovina	I		I		20	20
Botswana	I		I		20	20
Brazil	I		I		20	20
Brunei Darussalam	C		C		92.5	92.5
Bulgaria	I	H[a]	I	H[a]	30	30

Member State	Level in 2009	Voluntary level during 2009 if different	Level in 2010-2012 based on data for 2002-2007	Assumed voluntary level in 2010-2012 if different	Percentage of regular budget rates payable	
					2010	2011-2012
Burkina Faso	J		J		10	10
Burundi	J		J		10	10
Cambodia	J		J		10	10
Cameroon	I		I		20	20
Canada	B		B		100	100
Cape Verde	J		J		10	10
Central African Republic	J		J		10	10
Chad	J		J		10	10
Chile	I		I		20	20
China	A		A		100+	100+
Colombia	I		I		20	20
Comoros	J		J		10	10
Congo	I		I		20	20
Costa Rica	I		I		20	20
Côte d'Ivoire	I		I		20	20
Croatia	I		H		20	20
Cuba	I		I		20	20
Cyprus	B		B		100	100
Czech Republic	G		F[b]		45	60
Democratic People's Republic of Korea	I		I		20	20
Democratic Republic of the Congo	J		J		10	10
Denmark	B		B		100	100
Djibouti	J		J		10	10
Dominica	I		I		20	20
Dominican Republic	I		I		20	20
Ecuador	I		I		20	20
Egypt	I		I		20	20
El Salvador	I		I		20	20
Equatorial Guinea	J		J		10	10
Eritrea	J		J		10	10

Member State	*Level in 2009*	*Voluntary level during 2009 if different*	*Level in 2010-2012 based on data for 2002-2007*	*Assumed voluntary level in 2010-2012 if different*	*Percentage of regular budget rates payable*	
					2010	*2011-2012*
Estonia	I	B	F	B	100	100
Ethiopia	J		J		10	10
Fiji	I		I		20	20
Finland	B		B		100	100
France	A		A		100+	100+
Gabon	I		I		20	20
Gambia	J		J		10	10
Georgia	I		I		20	20
Germany	B		B		100	100
Ghana	I		I		20	20
Greece	B		B		100	100
Grenada	I		I		20	20
Guatemala	I		I		20	20
Guinea	J		J		10	10
Guinea-Bissau	J		J		10	10
Guyana	I		I		20	20
Haiti	J		J		10	10
Honduras	I		I		20	20
Hungary	H	B	F		40	40
Iceland	B		B		100	100
India	I		I		20	20
Indonesia	I		I		20	20
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	I		I		20	20
Iraq	I		I		20	20
Ireland	B		B		100	100
Israel	B		B		100	100
Italy	B		B		100	100
Jamaica	I		I		20	20
Japan	B		B		100	100
Jordan	I		I		20	20

Member State	Level in 2009	Voluntary level during 2009 if different	Level in 2010-2012 based on data for 2002-2007	Assumed voluntary level in 2010-2012 if different	Percentage of regular budget rates payable	
					2010	2011-2012
Kazakhstan	I		I		20	20
Kenya	I		I		20	20
Kiribati	J		J		10	10
Kuwait	C		C		92.5	92.5
Kyrgyzstan	I		I		20	20
Lao People's Democratic Republic	J		J		10	10
Latvia	I	H*[a]	H	H*[c]	30	30
Lebanon	I		I		20	20
Lesotho	J		J		10	10
Liberia	J		J		10	10
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	I		H		20	20
Liechtenstein	B		B		100	100
Lithuania	I	H*[a]	H	H*[c]	30	30
Luxembourg	B		B		100	100
Madagascar	J		J		10	10
Malawi	J		J		10	10
Malaysia	I		I		20	20
Maldives	J		J		10	10
Mali	J		J		10	10
Malta	D	B	B	B[d]	100	100
Marshall Islands	I		I		20	20
Mauritania	J		J		10	10
Mauritius	I		I		20	20
Mexico	H		H		20	20
Micronesia (Federated States of)	I		I		20	20
Monaco	B		B		100	100
Mongolia	I		I		20	20
Montenegro	I		I		20	20
Morocco	I		I		20	20
Mozambique	J		J		10	10

Member State	*Level in 2009*	*Voluntary level during 2009, if different*	*Level in 2010-2012 based on data for 2002-2007*	*Assumed voluntary level in 2010-2012, if different*	*Percentage of regular budget rates payable*	
					2010	*2011-2012*
Myanmar	J		J		10	10
Namibia	I		I		20	20
Nauru	I		I		20	20
Nepal	J		J		10	10
Netherlands	B		B		100	100
New Zealand	B		B		100	100
Nicaragua	I		I		20	20
Niger	J		J		10	10
Nigeria	I		I		20	20
Norway	B		B		100	100
Oman	F		F		40	40
Pakistan	I		I		20	20
Palau	H		H		20	20
Panama	I		I		20	20
Papua New Guinea	I		I		20	20
Paraguay	I		I		20	20
Peru	I		I		20	20
Philippines	I		I		20	20
Poland	I	H*[a]	H	H*[a]	30	30
Portugal	B		B		100	100
Qatar	C		C		92.5	92.5
Republic of Korea	B		B		100	100
Republic of Moldova	I		I		20	20
Romania	I	H*[a]	I	H*[a]	30	30
Russian Federation	A		A		100+	100+
Rwanda	J		J		10	10
Saint Kitts and Nevis	G		H		20	20
Saint Lucia	I		I		20	20
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	I		I		20	20
Samoa	J		J		10	10

Member State	*Level in 2009*	*Voluntary level during 2009 if different*	*Level in 2010-2012 based on data for 2002-2007*	*Assumed voluntary level in 2010-2012 if different*	*Percentage of regular budget rates payable*	
					2010	*2011-2012*
San Marino	B		B		100	100
Sao Tome and Principe	J		J		10	10
Saudi Arabia	F		E		60	60
Senegal	J		J		10	10
Serbia	I		I		20	20
Seychelles	F		F		40	40
Sierra Leone	J		J		10	10
Singapore	C		C		92.5	92.5
Slovakia	I	H*[a]	G		30	30
Slovenia	B		B		100	100
Solomon Islands	J		J		10	10
Somalia	J		J		10	10
South Africa	I		I		20	20
Spain	B		B		100	100
Sri Lanka	I		I		20	20
Sudan	J		J		10	10
Suriname	I		I		20	20
Swaziland	I		I		20	20
Sweden	B		B		100	100
Switzerland	B		B		100	100
Syrian Arab Republic	I		I		20	20
Tajikistan	I		I		20	20
Thailand	I		I		20	20
The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	I		I		20	20
Timor-Leste	J		J		10	10
Togo	J		J		10	10
Tonga	I		I		20	20
Trinidad and Tobago	G		E[b]		45	60
Tunisia	I		I		20	20

Member State	*Level in 2009*	*Voluntary level during 2009 if different*	*Level in 2010-2012 based on data for 2002-2007*	*Assumed voluntary level in 2010-2012 if different*	*Percentage of regular budget rates payable*	
					2010	*2011-2012*
Turkey	I		I		20	20
Turkmenistan	I		I		20	20
Tuvalu	J		J		10	10
Uganda	J		J		10	10
Ukraine	I		I		20	20
United Arab Emirates	C		C		92.5	92.5
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	A		A		100+	100+
United Republic of Tanzania	J		J		10	10
United States of America	A		A		100+	100+
Uruguay	I		I		20	20
Uzbekistan	I		I		20	20
Vanuatu	J		J		10	10
Venezuela	I		I		20	20
Viet Nam	I		I		20	20
Yemen	J		J		10	10
Zambia	J		J		10	10
Zimbabwe	I		I		20	20

[a] Member States that moved voluntarily up to level H paid at 30 per cent of their regular budget and it is assumed that this will continue.

[b] Two-year phasing for Member States moving up.

[c] See annex I to the present report.

[d] As Malta was placed in level B voluntarily in 2006, it is assumed that its movement from level D to level B based on per capita GNI data will not involve a transition period.

Annex IV

Effective rates of assessment for peacekeeping operations, 1 January 2010 to 31 December 2012, based on the results of the application of the methodology used in preparing the scale of assessments for the period 2007-2009 to GNI data for the period 2002-2007[a]

Member State	*Effective rate in 2009*	*Regular budget 2010-2012*	*Effective rates*	
			2010	*2011-2012*
Level A				
China	3.1474	3.189	3.9387	3.9340
France	7.4359	6.123	7.5625	7.5533
Russian Federation	1.4161	1.602	1.9786	1.9762
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	7.8383	6.604	8.1565	8.1467
United States of America	25.9624	22.000	27.1720	27.1392
Total A	**45.8001**	**39.518**	**48.8084**	**48.7494**
Level B				
Andorra	0.0080	0.007	0.0070	0.0070
Australia	1.7870	1.933	1.9330	1.9330
Austria	0.8870	0.851	0.8510	0.8510
Bahamas	0.0160	0.018	0.0180	0.0180
Bahrain	0.0330	0.039	0.0390	0.0390
Belgium	1.1020	1.075	1.0750	1.0750
Canada	2.9770	3.207	3.2070	3.2070
Cyprus	0.0440	0.046	0.0460	0.0460
Denmark	0.7390	0.736	0.7360	0.7360
Estonia	0.0160	0.040	0.0400	0.0400
Finland	0.5640	0.566	0.5660	0.5660
Germany	8.5770	8.018	8.0180	8.0180
Greece	0.5960	0.691	0.6910	0.6910
Iceland	0.0370	0.042	0.0420	0.0420
Ireland	0.4450	0.498	0.4980	0.4980
Israel	0.4190	0.384	0.3840	0.3840
Italy	5.0790	4.999	4.9990	4.9990
Japan	16.6240	12.530	12.5300	12.5300
Liechtenstein	0.0100	0.009	0.0090	0.0090
Luxembourg	0.0850	0.090	0.0900	0.0900
Malta	0.0170	0.017	0.0170	0.0170
Monaco	0.0030	0.003	0.0030	0.0030
Netherlands	1.8730	1.855	1.8550	1.8550

Member State	*Effective rate in 2009*	*Regular budget 2010-2012*	*Effective rates*	
			2010	*2011-2012*
New Zealand	0.2560	0.273	0.2730	0.2730
Norway	0.7820	0.871	0.8710	0.8710
Portugal	0.5270	0.511	0.5110	0.5110
Republic of Korea	2.1730	2.260	2.2600	2.2600
San Marino	0.0030	0.003	0.0030	0.0030
Slovenia	0.0960	0.103	0.1030	0.1030
Spain	2.9680	3.177	3.1770	3.1770
Sweden	1.0710	1.064	1.0640	1.0640
Switzerland	1.2160	1.130	1.1300	1.1300
Total B	**51.0300**	**47.046**	**47.0460**	**47.0460**
Level C				
Brunei Darussalam	0.0241	0.028	0.0259	0.0259
Kuwait	0.1684	0.263	0.2433	0.2433
Qatar	0.0786	0.135	0.1249	0.1249
Singapore	0.3210	0.335	0.3099	0.3099
United Arab Emirates	0.2794	0.391	0.3617	0.3617
Total C	**0.8714**	**1.152**	**1.0656**	**1.0656**
Level E				
Barbados	0.0054	0.008	0.0048	0.0048
Saudi Arabia	0.2992	0.830	0.4980	0.4980
Total E	**0.3046**	**0.838**	**0.5028**	**0.5028**
Transition to E				
Czech Republic	0.0843	0.349	0.1571	0.2094
Trinidad and Tobago	0.0081	0.044	0.0198	0.0264
Total Transition to E	**0.0924**	**0.393**	**0.1769**	**0.2358**
Level F				
Antigua and Barbuda	0.0008	0.002	0.0008	0.0008
Hungary	0.2440	0.291	0.1164	0.1164
Oman	0.0292	0.086	0.0344	0.0344
Seychelles	0.0008	0.002	0.0008	0.0008
Total F	**0.2248**	**0.381**	**0.1524**	**0.1524**
Level G				
Slovakia	0.0189	0.142	0.0426	0.0426
Total G	**0.0189**	**0.142**	**0.0426**	**0.0426**
Level H*				
Bulgaria	0.0060	0.038	0.0114	0.0114

Member State	Effective rate in 2009	Regular budget 2010-2012	Effective rates 2010	Effective rates 2011-2012
Latvia	0.0054	0.038	0.0114	0.0114
Lithuania	0.0093	0.065	0.0195	0.0195
Poland	0.1503	0.828	0.2484	0.2484
Romania	0.0210	0.177	0.0531	0.0531
Total H*	**0.1920**	**1.146**	**0.3438**	**0.3438**
Level H				
Croatia	0.0100	0.097	0.0194	0.0194
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	0.0124	0.129	0.0258	0.0258
Mexico	0.4514	2.356	0.4712	0.4712
Palau	0.0002	0.001	0.0002	0.0002
Saint Kitts and Nevis	0.0003	0.001	0.0002	0.0002
Total H	**0.4743**	**2.584**	**0.5168**	**0.5168**
Level I				
Albania	0.0012	0.010	0.0020	0.0020
Algeria	0.0170	0.128	0.0256	0.0256
Argentina	0.0650	0.287	0.0574	0.0574
Armenia	0.0004	0.005	0.0010	0.0010
Azerbaijan	0.0010	0.015	0.0030	0.0030
Belarus	0.0040	0.042	0.0084	0.0084
Belize	0.0002	0.001	0.0002	0.0002
Bolivia	0.0012	0.007	0.0014	0.0014
Bosnia and Herzegovina	0.0012	0.014	0.0028	0.0028
Botswana	0.0028	0.018	0.0036	0.0036
Brazil	0.1752	1.611	0.3222	0.3222
Cameroon	0.0018	0.011	0.0022	0.0022
Chile	0.0322	0.236	0.0472	0.0472
Colombia	0.0210	0.144	0.0288	0.0288
Congo	0.0002	0.003	0.0006	0.0006
Costa Rica	0.0064	0.034	0.0068	0.0068
Côte d'Ivoire	0.0018	0.010	0.0020	0.0020
Cuba	0.0108	0.071	0.0142	0.0142
Democratic People's Republic of Korea	0.0014	0.007	0.0014	0.0014
Dominica	0.0002	0.001	0.0002	0.0002
Dominican Republic	0.0048	0.042	0.0084	0.0084
Ecuador	0.0042	0.040	0.0080	0.0080
Egypt	0.0176	0.094	0.0188	0.0188
El Salvador	0.0040	0.019	0.0038	0.0038

Member State	Effective rate in 2009	Regular budget 2010-2012	Effective rates 2010	2011-2012
Fiji	0.0006	0.004	0.0008	0.0008
Gabon	0.0016	0.014	0.0028	0.0028
Georgia	0.0006	0.006	0.0012	0.0012
Ghana	0.0008	0.006	0.0012	0.0012
Grenada	0.0002	0.001	0.0002	0.0002
Guatemala	0.0064	0.028	0.0056	0.0056
Guyana	0.0002	0.001	0.0002	0.0002
Honduras	0.0010	0.008	0.0016	0.0016
India	0.0900	0.534	0.1068	0.1068
Indonesia	0.0322	0.238	0.0476	0.0476
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	0.0360	0.233	0.0466	0.0466
Iraq	0.0030	0.020	0.0040	0.0040
Jamaica	0.0020	0.014	0.0028	0.0028
Jordan	0.0024	0.014	0.0028	0.0028
Kazakhstan	0.0058	0.076	0.0152	0.0152
Kenya	0.0020	0.012	0.0024	0.0024
Kyrgyzstan	0.0002	0.001	0.0002	0.0002
Lebanon	0.0068	0.033	0.0066	0.0066
Malaysia	0.0380	0.253	0.0506	0.0506
Marshall Islands	0.0002	0.001	0.0002	0.0002
Mauritius	0.0022	0.011	0.0022	0.0022
Micronesia (Federated States of)	0.0002	0.001	0.0002	0.0002
Mongolia	0.0002	0.002	0.0004	0.0004
Montenegro	0.0002	0.004	0.0008	0.0008
Morocco	0.0084	0.058	0.0116	0.0116
Namibia	0.0012	0.008	0.0016	0.0016
Nauru	0.0002	0.001	0.0002	0.0002
Nicaragua	0.0004	0.003	0.0006	0.0006
Nigeria	0.0096	0.078	0.0156	0.0156
Pakistan	0.0118	0.082	0.0164	0.0164
Panama	0.0046	0.022	0.0044	0.0044
Papua New Guinea	0.0004	0.002	0.0004	0.0004
Paraguay	0.0010	0.007	0.0014	0.0014
Peru	0.0156	0.090	0.0180	0.0180
Philippines	0.0156	0.090	0.0180	0.0180
Republic of Moldova	0.0002	0.002	0.0004	0.0004
Saint Lucia	0.0002	0.001	0.0002	0.0002
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	0.0002	0.001	0.0002	0.0002

Member State	Effective rate in 2009	Regular budget 2010-2012	Effective rates 2010	2011-2012
Serbia	0.0042	0.037	0.0074	0.0074
South Africa	0.0580	0.385	0.0770	0.0770
Sri Lanka	0.0032	0.019	0.0038	0.0038
Suriname	0.0002	0.003	0.0006	0.0006
Swaziland	0.0004	0.003	0.0006	0.0006
Syrian Arab Republic	0.0032	0.025	0.0050	0.0050
Tajikistan	0.0002	0.002	0.0004	0.0004
Thailand	0.0372	0.209	0.0418	0.0418
The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	0.0010	0.007	0.0014	0.0014
Tonga	0.0002	0.001	0.0002	0.0002
Tunisia	0.0062	0.030	0.0060	0.0060
Turkey	0.0762	0.617	0.1234	0.1234
Turkmenistan	0.0012	0.026	0.0052	0.0052
Ukraine	0.0090	0.087	0.0174	0.0174
Uruguay	0.0034	0.027	0.0054	0.0054
Uzbekistan	0.0016	0.010	0.0020	0.0020
Venezuela	0.0400	0.314	0.0628	0.0628
Viet Nam	0.0048	0.033	0.0066	0.0066
Zimbabwe	0.0016	0.003	0.0006	0.0006
Total I	**0.9316**	**6.648**	**1.3296**	**1.3296**
Level J				
Afghanistan	0.0001	0.004	0.0004	0.0004
Angola	0.0003	0.010	0.0010	0.0010
Bangladesh	0.0010	0.010	0.0010	0.0010
Benin	0.0001	0.003	0.0003	0.0003
Bhutan	0.0001	0.001	0.0001	0.0001
Burkina Faso	0.0002	0.003	0.0003	0.0003
Burundi	0.0001	0.001	0.0001	0.0001
Cambodia	0.0001	0.003	0.0003	0.0003
Cape Verde	0.0001	0.001	0.0001	0.0001
Central African Republic	0.0001	0.001	0.0001	0.0001
Chad	0.0001	0.002	0.0002	0.0002
Comoros	0.0001	0.001	0.0001	0.0001
Democratic Republic of the Congo	0.0003	0.003	0.0003	0.0003

Member State	Effective rate in 2009	Regular budget 2010-2012	Effective rates	
			2010	2011-2012
Djibouti	0.0001	0.001	0.0001	0.0001
Equatorial Guinea	0.0002	0.008	0.0008	0.0008
Eritrea	0.0001	0.001	0.0001	0.0001
Ethiopia	0.0003	0.008	0.0008	0.0008
Gambia	0.0001	0.001	0.0001	0.0001
Guinea	0.0001	0.002	0.0002	0.0002
Guinea-Bissau	0.0001	0.001	0.0001	0.0001
Haiti	0.0002	0.003	0.0003	0.0003
Kiribati	0.0001	0.001	0.0001	0.0001
Lao People's Democratic Republic	0.0001	0.001	0.0001	0.0001
Lesotho	0.0001	0.001	0.0001	0.0001
Liberia	0.0001	0.001	0.0001	0.0001
Madagascar	0.0002	0.003	0.0003	0.0003
Malawi	0.0001	0.001	0.0001	0.0001
Maldives	0.0001	0.001	0.0001	0.0001
Mali	0.0001	0.003	0.0003	0.0003
Mauritania	0.0001	0.001	0.0001	0.0001
Mozambique	0.0001	0.003	0.0003	0.0003
Myanmar	0.0005	0.006	0.0006	0.0006
Nepal	0.0003	0.006	0.0006	0.0006
Niger	0.0001	0.002	0.0002	0.0002
Rwanda	0.0001	0.001	0.0001	0.0001
Samoa	0.0001	0.001	0.0001	0.0001
Sao Tome and Principe	0.0001	0.001	0.0001	0.0001
Senegal	0.0004	0.006	0.0006	0.0006
Sierra Leone	0.0001	0.001	0.0001	0.0001
Solomon Islands	0.0001	0.001	0.0001	0.0001
Somalia	0.0001	0.001	0.0001	0.0001
Sudan	0.0010	0.010	0.0010	0.0010
Timor-Leste	0.0001	0.001	0.0001	0.0001
Togo	0.0001	0.001	0.0001	0.0001
Tuvalu	0.0001	0.001	0.0001	0.0001
Uganda	0.0003	0.006	0.0006	0.0006
United Republic of Tanzania	0.0006	0.008	0.0008	0.0008
Vanuatu	0.0001	0.001	0.0001	0.0001

Member State	*Effective rate in 2009*	*Regular budget 2010-2012*	*Effective rates*	
			2010	*2011-2012*
Yemen	0.0007	0.010	0.0010	0.0010
Zambia	0.0001	0.004	0.0004	0.0004
Total J	**0.0100**	**0.152**	**0.0152**	**0.0152**
Grand total	**100.0000**	**100.000**	**100.0000**	**100.0000**

Note: The effective rates of assessment for peacekeeping operations shown above are calculated according to the system of adjustments adopted in General Assembly resolution 55/235 (see annex I) and are displayed at 4 decimal places.

[a] Included in the report of the Committee on Contributions (A/64/11, para. 74) for information.